REMARKS

I. Introduction

Claims 1-14 and 35 remain pending in the present application. In view of the following remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all of the presently pending claims are allowable.

II. The Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) Should Be Withdrawn

Claims 1-14 and 35 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,678,738 to Haverstock et al. ("Haverstock"). (See 5/20/05 Office Action, p. 2, ¶ 3).

Haverstock describes a web server that responds to requests from a web browser for either HTML or non-HTML documents and returns the requested documents to the web browser. (See Haverstock, col. 2, ll. 58-61). A network system 10 includes both HTML objects 50a-50n and non-HTML objects 18a-18n residing in respective databases 48 and 16, a web browser 28 residing in a terminal 26, a client 12 , and a server 14 which includes an HTTP server module 30, an interface module 32, and a non-HTML server module 24. (Id. at col. 3, ll. 30-53). The interface module 32 includes a URL interface 46 and an HTML translator 44. When a user submits a URL-based request for a non-HTML object via the browser 28, the request is passed to the server 14 via the HTTP server module 30. The URL interface 46 transmits the location of the object to the non-HTML server module 24, which retrieves the object and passes it to the interface module 32. The HTML translator 44 translates the object to an HTML representation of the object. The HTML representation is then returned to the browser 28. (Id. at col. 3, ll. 54-65).

The invention of the present application relates to a method and system for retrieving and presenting data from a target system. According to an exemplary embodiment of the present invention, when a client is launched by a user, target system information, such as the processor type and operating system of the target system is retrieved. (See Specification, p. 7, l. 23 - p. 8, l. 1). Object description files corresponding to the target system information (e.g., the operating system) are retrieved, and the client enumerates all objects supported. (Id. at p. 8, ll. 1-5). The client requests further details for an object selected by the user, and a data retrieval program corresponding to the target system information (e.g., the processor) is retrieved. (Id. at p. 8, ll. 15-20). The data retrieval program gathers data about the selected object, and the data is decoded before being sent to the client along with a presentation format which instructs the client on how to display the decoded data. (Id. at p. 8, l. 25 - p. 9, l. 5).

Claim 1 recites a method for retrieving and presenting data from a target system comprising "receiving target system information from the target system; retrieving a set of object description files corresponding to the target system information; sending to a client a set of objects supported based on the set of object description files retrieved; receiving a selected object from the client; selecting one of the set of object description files corresponding to the selected object; retrieving one of a set of data retrieval programs corresponding to the target system information; retrieving object data about the selected object using the retrieved one of the set of data retrieval programs; decoding the object data about the user selected object using the selected one of the set of object description files corresponding to the selected object to form decoded object data; and sending the decoded object data and a presentation format to the client allowing the client to be data driven."

It is respectfully submitted that Haverstock neither discloses nor suggests the steps recited in claim 1, including "*receiving target system information from the target system; retrieving a set of object description files corresponding to the target system information; sending to a client a set of objects supported based on the set of object description files retrieved; receiving a selected object from the client*; [and] *selecting one of the set of object*

description files corresponding to the selected object." In the rejection, the Examiner stated that the non-HTML object of Haverstock is analogous to the target system information of the present invention. (See 5/20/05 Office Action, p. 2, ¶ 3). However, the non-HTML objects are only data objects, and do not provide information regarding the system. For example, the non-HTML objects do not provide information regarding an operating system or a processor of the server 14. Haverstock states that the non-HTML database 16 stores non-HTML objects 18a-18n having non-HTML fields, in addition to user objects 22a-22n, which are also non-HTML objects and include information about a user. (See Haverstock, col. 3, ll. 45-52). Neither the non-HTML objects 18a-18n nor the user objects 22a-22n provide system information.

In addition, it is unclear as to what the Examiner considers to be the analogue of the object description file. Haverstock teaches only that the non-HTML objects may be translated before being sent to the user. No mention is made regarding the transmission of files which describe the non-HTML objects. However, even if this were not the case, the non-HTML objects are only sent based on the user request. That is, the non-HTML objects are sent in a nonselective manner whenever the user requests the non-HTML objects. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that Haverstock neither discloses nor suggests "receiving target system information from the target system; retrieving a set of object description files corresponding to the target system information; sending to a client a set of objects supported based on the set of object description files retrieved; receiving a selected object from the client; [and] selecting one of the set of object description files corresponding to the selected object," as recited in claim 1.

It is also respectfully submitted that Haverstock neither discloses nor suggests "*retrieving object data about the selected object using the retrieved one of the set of data retrieval programs; decoding the object data about the user selected object using the selected one of the set of object description files corresponding to the selected object to form decoded object data; and sending the decoded object data and a presentation format to the client allowing the client to be data driven.*" Although the interface module 32 translates the non-HTML objects, the interface module 32 retrieves the non-HTML objects themselves, rather than

object data corresponding to the non-HTML objects. The present invention teaches and recites in claim 1 that it is data about the object—not the object itself—which is returned to the client. Furthermore, no mention is made that the translation is performed using object description files. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that Haverstock neither discloses nor suggests "retrieving object data about the selected object using the retrieved one of the set of data retrieval programs; decoding the object data about the user selected object using the selected one of the set of object description files corresponding to the selected object to form decoded object data; and sending the decoded object data and a presentation format to the client allowing the client to be data driven," as recited in claim 1.

It is respectfully submitted that for at least the reasons discussed above, Haverstock does not anticipate the limitations of claim 1. As claims 2-14 depend from, and, therefore include the limitations of claim 1, it is respectfully submitted that these claims are also allowable. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 1-14 be withdrawn.

Claim 35 was rejected on the same grounds as claim 1. (See 5/20/05 Office Action, p. 2, ¶ 3). Claim 35 recites substantially the same limitations as claim 1. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that this claim should also be allowed for at least the reasons discussed above with reference to claim 1. As such, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 35 be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

In light of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that all of the now pending claims are in condition for allowance. All issues raised by the Examiner having been addressed, an early and favorable action on the merits is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: August 22, 2005

By: _____
Michael J. Marcin (Reg. No. 48,198)

Fay Kaplun & Marcin, LLP
150 Broadway, Suite 702
New York, New York 10038
Tel: (212) 619-6000
Fax: (212) 619-0276